UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

An Epoch in Liberal Religious Journalism - - - - - - *Harold P. Marley*

The Jew's New Image of Himself - - - - - - - *Lester Mondale*

The Meaning of Tolerance - *William P. Jenkins*

The Liberal Way for Today - *John H. Hershey*

Now Is the Hour - - - - *J. Ray Shute*

The Impudence of the Mystics - - - - - - *George Lawrence Parker*

Western Conference News

VOLUME CXLI No. 2

Chicago, May-June, 1955

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly *Subscription $1.50*

Except During July-August *Single Copies 25 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter October 7, 1952, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

CONTRIBUTORS

John H. Hershey: Minister of the First Congregational Parish in Easton, Massachusetts.

William P. Jenkins: Minister of the First Unitarian Congregation, Toronto.

Harold P. Marley: Psychiatric Social Worker, Staff of the Illinois Department of Public Welfare.

Lester Mondale: Leader of the Philadelphia Ethical Society.

George Lawrence Parker: Formerly Minister of the First Unitarian Church, Toledo, Ohio.

J. Ray Shute: Former Mayor of Monroe, North Carolina; editorial writer, *The Christian Register*.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL—Curtis W. Reese 23

ARTICLES—

An Epoch in Liberal Religious Journalism—Harold P. Marley 24

The Jew's New Image of Himself—Lester Mondale 26

The Meaning of Tolerance—William P. Jenkins 29

The Liberal Way for Today—John H. Hershey 31

Now Is the Hour—J. Ray Shute 32

The Impudence of the Mystics—George Lawrence Parker 34

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 35

THE FIELD—

Religious Garb—*ACLU BULLETIN* 22

THE FIELD

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion"

Religious Garb

The American Civil Liberties Union has reiterated—in a legal document—its belief that no teacher in a public school should be permitted to wear religious garb.

On the other hand, the Union argued, no person should be barred from public school teaching solely because of membership in a religious order.

The ACLU's latest presentation of this viewpoint was made in a friend of the court brief filed with the Kentucky Court of Appeals in a suit brought by The Reverend J. C. Rawlings of Bradfordsville against the Kentucky State Superintendent of Public Instruction and the boards of education in six counties where 84 Roman Catholic nuns work as public school teachers.

"The 'wall of separation between church and state' prohibits religious indoctrination in behalf of any religion, denomination, or sect in the public schools," said the ACLU brief filed by S. Arnold Lynch of Louisville, an ACLU cooperating attorney.

"It prohibits the intrusion of any religion into the public school system. It is the duty of the State to prevent its occurrence. The wearing of religious garb by teachers while teaching is, on its face, such an intrusion. By doing so, the wearer brings into the classroom the symbol of his religious Order, and, conciously or unconsciously, proselytizes for his religion.

"Prohibiting the wearing of religious garb by public school teachers does not interfere with their religious beliefs and observances. If it did, we would be the first to oppose the prohibition. Such a prohibition is merely the proper application of the constitutional doctrine of separation of church and state. Religion and Government must not commingle in the public schools, for only then can the independence of every religion be assured; only then can the children be preserved from the involuntary influence of many religions not practiced by themselves and their parents. Permitting the members of one religious

(*Continued on page* 33)

UNITY

VOLUME CXLI MAY-JUNE, 1955 No. 2

EDITORIAL

The American Unitarian Association and the Universalist Church of America will meet simultaneously in separate sessions and in joint sessions as the Council of Liberal Churches, in Detroit, Michigan, August 25-29. Each denomination will report to its own delegates, and the Council of Liberal Churches will report to the joint sessions, on the problems, the successes, and, I hope, the frustrations of the first year of operation of the Federal Union project. On the affirmative side it can be said that Unitarian and Universalists have made some headway in learning to work together, and in the joint operation of the Departments of Education. On the negative side it can be said that the Department of Public Information is in budgetary difficulties due to financial emergencies in both denominations and may have to be liquidated, and in the Departments of Publication no significant advance has been made. The Universalist *Leader* is not controlled by the Universalist Church of America but by an independent Universalist Publishing House. The trustees of the Universalist Publishing House have voted to recommend to the corporate body that the *Leader* merge with the *Register* in a new publication under a name yet to be determined. But the corporate body has not yet acted on this recommendation and it is by no means certain that the action of the corporate body will be in the affirmative. Moreover, there are grave problems in connection with the combining of the Departments of Publication, since the Publication Department of the American Unitarian Association is a business with a budget larger than that of either denomination exclusive of Publications. The success of the Beacon Press and the Starr King Press is such that quite naturally the Association favors moving with caution in a matter involving such large risks. The matter of chief interest at Detroit will be the report of the Joint Interim Commission. At this date it is not known precisely what the recommendations of the Commission will be. A final meeting of the Commission will be held in Detroit immediately preceding the sessions of the two denominations. A considerable storm was created by an unfortunate preliminary report of the Commission in which it was indicated that the delegates of the two denominations would be asked to vote on a proposal for complete merger, and the setting up of machinery for a plebiscite of churches on the proposal. Should the final report of the Commission propose complete merger at this time, or even "sooner or later" in the words of the preliminary report, it would be unfortunate, since it appears that neither denomination is as yet ready to surrender its distinctive name and identity. The best that the friends of Unitarian and Universalist cooperation can hope for at this time is a continuation of the experiment of Federal Union. If Federal Union can be made to work successfully, then the future may hold some hope for complete merger in years ahead. To force the issue of complete merger now would in my judgment be a grave error and might well wreck the experiment of Federal Union.

Curtis W. Reese.

An Epoch In Liberal Religious Journalism

HAROLD P. MARLEY

This year Abraham Lincoln Centre of Chicago celebrates its Fiftieth Anniversary. It is a time for recalling events in the life of the founder, Jenkin Lloyd Jones, not the least of which was his long-time editorship of UNITY, which has recently had its seventy-fifth birthday.

Beginning in March of 1878 as the *Pamphlet Mission,* the name UNITY appeared in the masthead soon thereafter—a happy selection which seemed to epitomize the ecumenical approach to liberal religion. The five Unitarian ministers who were responsible for its genesis stated their credo in the sub-title, "Freedom, Fellowship, and Character in Religion," and this has remained down to the present day. It was further explained in the first issue that the avowed purpose was to publish liberal religious treatises "on the Unity, the Evolution, the Doctrines, the Bibles, and the Leaders of Religion." They said they would undertake to discuss the relation of religion "to science, to devotion, and conduct."

It seemed clear to these founders in the cultural upheaval following the terrible War of the States, that Christianity, however prevalent in Europe and America, was not to be considered superior or final. More important still, the basis for unity among all men was not in theistic belief as such, but in the daily practice and residual conduct of the person who claimed to be religious. They boldly deduced that ethics rather than dogma should be the least common denominator, and set to work to revise Sunday School lessons and service materials to meet this standard. Soon enough they were to discover that this forthright position led to dis-unity with some, while at the same time creating a tie with others. They were astute enough, however, to perceive that the former rift would in good time be healed, and that the bid for unity with the latter group would not wait.

One of these "Ethical Basis men," as they were later called, was the uncle of Frank Lloyd Wright. He was then minister of a Unitarian congregation at Janesville, Wisconsin, called The Independent Society of Liberal Christians, eventually changed to All Souls Church. His name, Jenkin Lloyd Jones, soon appeared on the masthead of UNITY as Senior Editor, where it remained until his death. It was his energetic devotion which made the publication into a weekly, with a large circulation, and the building up of a thirty-thousand dollar endowment fund. Jenkin Lloyd Jones was born in Wales, reared on a Wisconsin farm and inherited from his forefathers a clear-cut Arminian approach to religion which was non-Calvinistic and which affirmed man's freedom to accept or reject divine overtures.

During his long editorship, never on pay, he used the editorial columns to promulgate such important missions and events as the Parliament of Religions, in 1893; the Ford Peace Ship mission, on which he was a leader, in 1916; and, subsequently, opposition to the entry of this country into the war. His last act as editor was to read the August 29, 1918, issue on his sick bed. Mailing privileges had just been restored by the Postmaster General, following a two-month ban. He seemed satisfied. His beloved paper was back in circulation. Within five hours he closed his eyes for the last time.

In dying, it might be said that this man had outlived a score of battles, including some of the most bloody ones of the Civil War, from which he emerged to carry on a fight against all future wars. Dozens of theological tilts had been fought to a standstill, the most bitter of which was the issue of an ethical versus the Christian theist basis for Unitarian belief. Many liberal organizations, whose purposes he had espoused, had passed away, including the National Liberal League of Rev. Francis E. Abbott, of which Dr. Felix Adler was for three years the president, and the American Congress of Liberal Religion, organized in Chicago on May 22, 1894, following the adjournment of the Parliament of Religions. Of this, he was secretary.

A glance at these titles not only shows the ruling passion of "J. Ll. J." (as he signed his editorials) for things modern, but indicates the sincere efforts of liberals of all faiths to unite for the preservation of the free spirit in religion. That these men wanted unity because they felt threatened may be guessed by the prevalence in those days of such popular evangelical zealots as Dwight Moody and DeWitt Talmadge. That the position of the "Parker men" (as they were called) within the Unitarian church was rather precarious can be judged from the fact that the advocates of Christian theism sought to throw them out of the Western Conference. Jones did resign his position as Secretary, and his successor started an opposition publication to UNITY, called *The Unitarian.*

The editor-minister, now head of a strong church in Chicago which he had built from scratch, shifted his attention to the great World Parliament of Religions, held in connection with the Columbian Exposition, and sponsored by the United States Congress. Dr. Jones prepared his congregation by giving them a series of studies on the historic religions. As Secretary of the Parliament he helped guide it and harmonize it, and at the last session proposed another meeting in India seven years hence. Soon thereafter the American Conference of Liberal Religion was formed at a meeting at Mt. Sinai Temple in Chicago. Twenty-eight rabbis, seventy Unitarian ministers, twelve Universalist ministers, and four Ethical Leaders said they wanted "a larger fellowship of those who are in sympathy with the movement toward undogmatic religion." UNITY hailed the new Conference and assumed an integral role by changing its name to THE NEW UNITY (1895-98).

The kind of thing which these groups were doing was meeting a widespread need, not only in the Middle West but throughout the country wherever intellectuals were doing serious thinking in the area of religion and social change. The degree to which this leadership in the West was successful may be judged by the many publications which tried to meet the same need, but failed. Inability to balance subscriptions with publication costs caused many journals to reach out for a helping hand. In the years before 1886, mergers with UNITY occurred with *The Liberal Worker, The Spectroscope, The Church of The Unity, The Unitarian Advocate,* and *The Liberal.* In 1886, the year of the Haymarket affair, when Chicago was in a fever heat corresponding to that of the Great Fire, another publication joined, called *The University,* and it was of such

proportion that it brought along a chief editorial contributor and for about a year had its name printed in the masthead alongside UNITY. The next year came *The New Theology Herald* of Jamestown, New York.

As already suggested, the earliest struggles of Dr. Jones and the others were in the area of theological controversy—whether one might believe in the idea of God, or whether one had to believe in God, period. UNITY served as a free forum for the many who were challenging the old theological norms, some of whom were forced out of orthodoxy, such as Rev. A. M. Alcott, Robert Collyer, Roberson Smith, David Swing, and others. Some started independent churches, but, whatever the story, it was granted free space in the columns and a listening ear among the readers.

However, if religion was going to survive, and the UNITY kind of religion did survive, it had to do more than be a threshing machine to separate theological grain from chaff. Ethically-oriented religion has a social responsibility which John Haynes Holmes and Harry F. Ward began to point out in the columns. If Dr. Jones, the unrepentant member of the Ford Peace Ship, opposed World War I, it is not surprising that the associate editor, John Haynes Holmes, wanted to make of UNITY a Pacifist journal in World War II. If the preparation of the "peace mind" in 1914 had been the Parliament of Religions, the indoctrination for peace at the later date may have been the socio-economic revolution in Russia as interpreted at that time by the Editorial Contributor, Percy M. Dawson. At the paper's fortieth birthday, Dr. Jones commented that "UNITY has witnessed the coming of the telegraph, the phonograph, the automobile, the wireless, and the aeroplane." These, he said, together with the successful Parliament of Religions, are tools for human brotherhood. He sincerely believed that a world ethic which would end war was about to be realized, failing to see that tools are of little value unless used by skilled hands.

In the area of social progress within nations, the broad policy of UNITY for equal rights cannot be questioned. As minister of the thriving All Souls church, Dr. Jones prided himself on attracting to his pews people of all walks and economic stations in society. In 1882, when he was engaged in a building-program for his functional-oriented church across the street from where Abraham Lincoln Centre now stands, the ranks of labor were agitated over their right to an eight-hour day. UNITY, which was read by all his parishioners, printed a forthright article by William C. Gannett, upholding this objective. Factories were on strike, and at a mass meeting before the gate of one of the reaper plants, a tragic happening occurred which plunged Chicago into a panic and reversed the trend for the shorter working day. Some unknown person threw a bomb into the massed ranks of oncoming police. Innocent men were rounded up like sheep, and seven were placed on trial for murder.

The editor of UNITY and the Ethical Society leader were the two clergymen who cried out against the slaughter of the innocents. (An article by this title appeared in UNITY during the trial, but upon examination, it turned out to be a plea for preserving wild life.) Just why there was such a studied silence in the columns during the nation-wide interest in the trial is something of a mystery—probably explained by the wild hysteria which existed. The first reference is in a December issue, after the mass-hanging had taken place. It was made by a minister in Warwick, Massachusetts, who wrote a letter just before the execution, which was printed without comment. He said that although the death penalty might be necessary, he did not like the "brute and savage howl of revenge. . . . Since they did not throw the bomb, they should be killed with deep sorrow and pity." This propitiatory death of Albert Parsons and the others he hoped would make an impression on ministers and be a rebuke to the churches. His militant conclusion was that there is "grandeur and glory and inspiration in that despised flag [the red flag of anarchism, symbolizing the same red blood of all humanity] . . . who knows but that it may wave on the breeze when the Stars and Stripes are long forgotten."

In defense of the editorial silence of UNITY, one only has to turn the pages of history to the day when two Italians were waiting death in the cell-house of a Massachusetts jail. Then, the situation was reversed—Chicagoans were writing letters to Boston.

If the editor of UNITY insisted that his church members aid in the support of its publication, he also asked the readers to help him build his church which had now voted itself away from denominational ties. All Souls, in the frame building, and later in the six-story brick Abraham Lincoln Centre, was not, he said, "a perfunctory gospel mill, but a business house, doing business seven days a week." He described himself as "a minister of this world."

Visitors often come to Abraham Lincoln Centre to study its architecture, for it is one of the first buildings which Frank Lloyd Wright had a hand in planning. A few come to visit the church and the club-rooms to remember the days when, as children, they sat at the feet of the master. There is a danger that the founder will come to be known simply as the uncle of the architect who also pioneered. Such would be a tragic fate for this man who believed in the sufficiency of Freedom, Fellowship, and Character in Religion. He was an architect of the city not built with hands. He was a builder of a temple with a canopy vast enough to shelter all mankind. This is not said as a perfunctory tribute to a bygone pioneer. It is the week-by-week evidence as recorded in the pages of the epochal journal which he produced.

The Right of Free Discussion

Freedom of opinion, of speech, and of the press is our most valuable privilege, the very soul of republican institutions, the safeguard of all other rights. . . . Nothing awakes and improves men so much as free communication of thoughts and feelings. Nothing can give to public sentiment that correctness which is essential to the prosperity of a commonwealth but the free circulation of truth from the lips and pens of the wise and good.

If such men abandon the right of free discussion; if awed by threats, they suppress their convictions; if rulers succeed in silencing every voice but that which approves them; if nothing reaches the people but what would lend support to men in power—farewell to liberty. The form of a free government may remain; but the life, the soul, the substance is fled.

William Ellery Channing.

The Jew's New Image of Himself

LESTER MONDALE

Nowhere did that ancient Jew, Jesus, son of Joseph and Mary, so completely give himself away as one who is human like all the rest of us, as he did walking along the road to Caesarea Philippi, when he turned to his Disciples and put to them this question: "Who do men say that I am?" If his Disciples, instead of answering that some people took him to be John the Baptist and others Elijah or one of the Prophets, had replied that the general consensus of opinion was coming to be that he was merely another crank or crackpot, that they the Disciples were now inclined to agree with the consensus, "Goodbye"—a consequent deflation of the ego of one Jesus would have been inevitable. On the other hand, no small portion of the power and the effectiveness with which this man pursued his messianic career to its dramatic climax must have come of Peter's audacious reply to Jesus' pressing of his question, "But who do you say that I am?", "Thou art the Christ!" He was the Messiah, someone most extraordinary. The extent to which the image others have of me harmonizes or fails to harmonize with my idea of myself spells all the difference between mental health and power, and neurosis with ineffectuality.

Three hundred years ago the Jew came to the shores of this country with a clear-cut image of himself. However, writes the Harvard Professor, Oscar Handlin, in his excellent book on the American Jew, *Adventure in Freedom:* ". . . The Jews stepped into a world different from that of Europe . . . in its attitudes towards them. Nowhere else had they encountered the image Americans held of them. The new views compelled the Jews radically to revise their own conceptions of themselves and of the nature of their culture."

For nearly three hundred years in America this revising of their conceptions of themselves went on more or less unconsciously as an automatic process of immigrant accommodation. Those who had come in the seventeen hundreds had so thoroughly accommodated themselves to the American scene that they were shocked by the strangeness of the German Jewish immigrants of the wave of the early eighteen hundreds; and these, in turn, after accommodation, were shocked and sometimes mortified by the strangeness of the Polish-Russian Jews of the mass-migration of the late eighteen hundreds. By 1920, however, these last migrants had lost most of their strangeness, lost their strangeness even to themselves. They also had become Americans —or so they thought! So they thought until about that same year, 1920, when it came to enrolling a son in college, until it came to securing the deed to a property where children could play on grass and rest in the shade of a tree. They were Americans, yes, legally. But they were also something that seemed to make them less than Americans. They were Jews.

Everybody, of course, did not feel that way toward them. Far, far from anything like a majority. Certain it was that those who sympathized with the Atlanta mob that lynched a Jew, one Leo Frank, flimsily convicted, in 1915, on a charge of murdering a fourteen-year-old girl, were very much in the minority. And the Ku Klux Klan, even in 1925 at the height of its cross-burnings, expressed not mere minority but the lunatic fringe. And Henry Ford with the Protocols of Zion; that fiasco, for all of the Ford name, was also the lunatic fringe. Then the Great Depression and the attempts to trace the depression to the machinations of the international Jew—again, the lunatic fringe. But add up all the lunatic Father Coughlin, Gerald L. K. Smith fringes, give them a crusading silver-tongued Hitler for a leader and then what? It happened in Germany of all places, and to everyone who could remotely be called a Jew. Could it not happen here also?

In the space of a very few years, as so many of you know only too well, everyone who even remotely could be thought of as a Jew, including the person who had never seen the inside of a Synagogue or lighted a Hanukkah candle, who was an atheist in the second or third generation, the son or daughter of a mixed marriage, who had married a Gentile, found himself forced to think of himself as a Jew. But just what it meant to be a Jew was, of course, far from being as clear as it appeared to some, emotionally wrought up as they were. It seemed in that hour of crisis to mean subscribing and subscribing liberally to anti-Fascist groups such as L. M. Birkhead's Friends of Democracy; subscribing and subscribing liberally to the saving of Jewish refugees from Nazi extermination. It meant buying bonds, if one could afford it, to help in the establishment and defense of Israel as the homeland of the Jew. Being a Jew seemed to many to call also for going back to the Synagogues, sending their children to Synagogue schools and observance again of Jewish Holy Days, for stressing in Jewish cultural centers what was specified as "Jewish content," for setting up an all-American Jewish Assembly to speak with one voice "in behalf of the totality of American Jews." For still others being a Jew seemed to call for what Oscar Handlin described as the "romantic vision of the old ghetto." Sustained and living by this vision the Jew here in America regarded himself merely as an exile, an exile filled with the sad longing for Zion, for Israel. In the meantime he went back to the dietary observances, to the Sabbath and all its rituals. Of these ghetto-dreamers Handlin writes:

> Every slight and insult, every act of hostility was expected, almost welcomed, as confirmatory evidence that they were right in not belonging. Their eyes on Zion, zeal served them as a protective shield against the bruising encounters with a world of which they wished no part.

That there was something decidedly lacking in this Hitler-evoked new image of the American Jew began to be apparent when Israel, the Israel that was to be the new Promised Land, the redemption of mankind, became established as a nation among nations. Now at long last the consummation of the hopes of centuries. ". . . persuasive voices urged the confirmed Zionists to migrate." And what happened? Wrote Handlin: "With the way open, they discovered at once that it was not on that far Mediterranean shore they belonged, but where they were in America." With this came further revelations of the inadequacy of the Hitler-evoked new image of the Jew. The conference that was called in 1943 to set up an all-American body to speak with one voice for Judaism broke up before the conference had come to its scheduled end. The movement to stress Jewish content in the productions of the

cultural centers came to naught when the question was asked: "What is Jewish content?" The once-flourishing Yiddish theater has come to almost nothing today, and the Yiddish press is not far behind. The Jewish college student, no longer pressed by his parents to be the genius, was discovered according to careful surveys to be indistinguishable from the gentile student and his mixing in social affairs is as complete as it is in the classrooms. Those who went back to the Synagogue found, sometimes with consternation and sometimes with the greatest of satisfaction, that what they were going back to was a religiosity that is far more specifically American than anything historically and peculiarly Jewish. About the high Holy Days one modern Jewish housewife of the new community of Forrest Hill, Illinois, remarked revealingly: "I believe Rosh Hashanah should be two days, Passover too . . . one day we go to his family, the other to mine." And as for L. M. Birkhead's anti-Fascist Friends of Democracy, once so effective and so thriving, that has long-since folded up for lack of the fears that made Jews dig into their pocketbooks so liberally for its support.

The American Jew obviously is someone who is vastly more than the recent Hitler-evoked image of the Jew. But just who is he?, we find ourselves asking. What has happened to him that despite occasional slurs from the lunatic fringe and remnants here and there of exclusion, he should feel so much at home, so enthusiastically and profoundly American?

To put together an image of the American Jew that even begins to do justice to the new person he has become as a result of his years in this country, one has to go back to the image of himself he brought from the ghettos of Europe.

He thought of himself when he came here as a man without a country. The Spain or the Italian Papal State from which he came might have been a homeland for Catholic Spaniards or Italians, but not for him the wearer of the yellow badge or the yellow hat or veil, not for him the stiff-necked alien who refused to see the light when preached at by Christian priests to whom he was forced periodically to listen in his own Synagogue. And similarly with the Jew in England, in France, in Germany, in Russia—in every case, the man without a country, the alien never knowing from one decade to another when some imperial expulsion decree would force him to flee for his life, or what new Jew-taxes, what new marriage limitations might be imposed upon him.

But when this man without a country came to the land of beginning again it was not long, what with his being accepted very shortly as a citizen, as a property-owning, voting, soldier citizen, before he began to think of himself as connected with older established and accepted families of New York, of Philadelphia, of Rhode Island: and then, similarly, southward and westward with the pioneers—Cincinnati, San Francisco, Tulsa, Kansas City. Then, presently, the Jew in Congress, the State Governor, the Secretary of War in the Cabinet of Jefferson Davis, the Supreme Court Justice. Then into the President's Cabinet. At the dinner in honor of the first Jewish Cabinet appointee, Oscar Straus, "Teddy" Roosevelt made this statement:

> I did not select him as a Jew. I went out to get the man in the whole United States best fitted for the job. Everywhere I turned Mr. Straus was recommended—therefore I appointed him, not as a Jew, but as the best man for the place.

The next speaker was Jacob H. Schiff who was so deaf he had not heard a word of the Roosevelt speech. He innocently went on to make a short talk out of what he knew of the appointment: how Roosevelt had sent for him and told him that he "wanted to appoint a Jew to his Cabinet; that he wished to be sure to get a Jew who would be acceptable to the Jewish community as well as to the politicians, and would Mr. Schiff suggest who . . ." The response to this, the spontaneous response of roaring laughter was such as could come only from men who knew that either interpretation of the Straus appointment, it made no real difference which, only served to confirm them not merely as citizens, but as important and respected citizens of the new homeland.

To America the Jew brought the image of himself not only as a man without a country but also as one who was different; and as different, despised and persecuted. In Christian Europe where Christian burned Christian for minor differences of belief, the unbeliever Jew was emphatically different, a religious freak in fact. He was someone against whom it was well that Christians should be carefully insulated. Hence the "pale of settlement" to which he was confined in Russia; hence the ghettos with prison-like gates, such as they had in the Papal states in Italy up to as late as 1870, that were closed against them each night and opened officially each morning. He was different and so he was forbidden to own land, and thus to make his living out of the soil, forbidden membership in the guilds and thus to make his living at a craft, forbidden higher education and access to the professions. But because he was different it was left to him to do the wicked and despised thing of lending money for interest. And then, like all peoples who are looked down upon for being different, he went on to demonstrate how essentially human and how little different he actually was underneath it all, by retaliating with secretly looking down upon the goyim and secretly taking pride in all that which set him apart and made him different from them.

But when this man who clung to his differences as his badge of honor in the sight of God arrived here in America he was not assigned by police officials to his ghetto and thus insulated from Christians, he was not forbidden to purchase land or on that land to erect as imposing a house as he could afford. What is more, when he arrived here he found a people that looked at him with a respect such as he had never encountered before. It was a respect which I could illustrate by quotations from history books, but to which I believe I can testify more effectively out of personal experience: My own first introduction to the Jew.

It was an evening when I was no more than six years old, when my mother had finished the usual bedtime reading, another of the fascinating stories of the Children of Israel from the Bible-story book. I asked her if any of the Children of Israel were still living. "Why, yes," she said, "I know one . . . and so do you, Jake Hirshfield; he's one of the Children of Israel." To be one of the Children of Israel, that for the Protestant American of a generation ago spelled someone not only story-book-like but also right out of the Holy Bible. But Jake Hirshfield! He was the man I connected so vividly with the loss of a dime, a precious dime, down the iron grating in front of his clothing store in my home town of Walnut Grove, Minnesota. I was sobbing. Then I was aware of him at my side, his hand on my shoulder. I pointed down to the shining dime in the depths below. "Listen, sonny. We'll get

it. We'll get it, don't you worry." He disappeared into the grocery store next and came out opening a package of gum. He chewed a stick, then stuck the chewed gum on the end of a wooden pole and worked and fished for possibly an hour before getting the dime out. And then what did he do but present me not only with the dime, but along with my dime the unused sticks of gum!

One more telling memory I connect with Jake Hirshfield—an iron bar with two enormous iron balls on either end, at the back of his store. It was the dumbbell by means of which, as I see it now, Jake put himself on a par physically with all the farmer hearties who shook his hands, respecting them where much of their pride lay and enjoying their respect. He, like millions of his compatriots, found he did not have to cling for self-respect to any peculiar badge of honor in the sight of God—not in America.

In Europe the Jew, the man without a country, had found a private kind of country, and the native language of that country, literally in his Synagogue. He found the laws for that private country and for his daily living in the Talmud that was studied in the Synagogue, and he found the government for his country centered in the rabbis of the Synagogue and in their interpretations of the Law. The Synagogue was his education, it was his charity in time of need, his appeal in a dispute with a ghetto neighbor, his sanctuary where all his peculiarities and differences, approved by God, took on the aura of the sacred. The Synagogue community was also an authority over him that had the civil power to tax him and to collect the taxes, and the power also to expel any member to the not-so-tender mercies of the surrounding jungle of Medieval Christianity. The Synagogue, in sum, was the seat of the government, the language, the law, the economy, the religion of a nation within a nation.

But when the man with only his Synagogue for his country found in America at long last a homeland he came to prefer above all others, even above Zion, found fellow citizens who respected him and did not drive him to cling to his peculiarities as his badge of honor in the sight of God . . . then it was inevitable that in the new world the Synagogue would have to go through a thoroughgoing revolution and come out the profoundly different and amazingly variegated Orthodox-Conservative-Reformed, Humanistic-Theistic, theological hodgepodge it is today. The new Synagogue, so radically different from the Medieval center of a nation-within-a-nation, is only what was bound to develop when the Jew, asking for permission to organize and build a temple, was met with, "Go ahead. Why not? Don't the Germans have their Lutheran churches? The Irish, their Catholic? The English, their Episcopal? The Mormons, their Tabernacles?" Why not? Why, in other words, regard Judaism as anything but another of the Friday night or Saturday or Sunday-go-to-meeting religions of Americans?

And the end result? The new image of the Jew? There seem in the main to be two new images emerging.

The new image, as many are coming to think of it, is described in that estimable book, *Commentary on the American Scene,* in Irving Howe's chapter on his trip to a New England city he calls "Sprucetown." There he talks with one of the older Jews, a junk dealer who at the same time is a reader of the New Republic and much of an individualist. The old man has some salt-and-pepper remarks to make about the new Jewish businessmen who have come to town and taken over in the Synagogue and even introduced an organ and English into the ritual. He dubs them, "alrightniks." Irving Howe calls on one of these "alrightniks" in his comfortable home, and gets his slant on what has developed. The old "shul":

> It was dirty, it stank; when you went in, there were old men in their stockings and with long beards. They had that gargle music. . . . Well, you know, it wasn't the kind of place you'd want to bring your wife and kids to. . . .

About the old man? The alrightnik feels he is "something of a trouble-maker, a little un-American. Now we have the finest type of Jew."

And the finest type of Jew?

> Well, you know, the kind that's clean, doesn't push himself or make noises; the kind that's respected and doesn't fool around with the Reds. Now we're part of the Community Chest, the goyim respect us. We're part of the town. Everyone respects the rabbi.

These, then, are the Jews who have taken over in this New England Temple and in this particular Jewish community, a class that Howe critically characterizes:

> . . . unquestioning, complacent acceptance of American society; slight interest in cultural or intellectual problems; complete absence of that deep, troubled, perhaps even agonized feeling that can result from religiosity; and, above all, a complete lack of self-doubt and self-criticism. . . . Their return to the temple does not mean that Judaism is making them over in its image; it means that they are making Judaism over in theirs.

But even this new image, for all of its accommodation to commercial middle-class respectability, does no more justice to the totality of the person the Jew has become in America than did the Hitler-evoked image we dealt with a few minutes ago.

I think I see the suggestion of a rather more comprehensive image in the account, found in the same book, *Commentary on the American Scene,* of another Jewish community. This is the story of some twenty families who in the nineteen thirties left the cliff dwellings of New York for farms in Lakewood, New Jersey, where, as one of the wives put it: "I would go out in the morning and breathe my own air, scoop up my own soil, touch my own trees, and pass my hand slowly along the walls of my own house."

They went to Lakewood not as Jews nor to set up a Jewish colony. Most of them were either definitely atheistic or entirely indifferent to Jewish customs, including Bar Mitzvah and the Holy Days. To Zionism they were wholly indifferent. And if the children at Christmastime wanted to set up a tree, why not? Their gentile farmer neighbors they welcomed to the cooperative they organized; gentile neighbor children they welcomed to the nursery school they established. But for all of their indifference to Judaism and for all of their spirit of open-armed neighborliness, these new farmers have come more and more to spend their hours of social intimacy with others of Jewish background, even to the point at last of joining the flock of the progressive young rabbi of a newly organized Reform Temple.

What is it that sets these Jews off from their gentile neighbors, that causes them to feel so much more at ease with those of Jewish background, however unorthodox that background? Is it some inherited peculiarity? Some ineradicable mystical difference? Or does it stem rather from more tangible differences. For instance, their social gatherings—in contrast to the unintellectual social affairs of the gentile neighbor, theirs

are more likely than not to be centered about the reading of one of Shaw's plays, or a talk by one of them on Joyce, Dostoyevski, Mann, Faulkner, Stendahl. In their homes, in contrast to what you find in the traditional gentile farmer home, you will find record libraries with Beethoven, Haydn, Burl Ives; and on crowded bookshelves, volumes by Freud, Karen Horney, Reich; and on the walls of their rooms, reproductions of Hals, of Renoir, of Picasso. Also in their chicken farming, in contrast to the traditional stodginess of the gentile farmer neighbor, they have gone at it scientifically, taking to heart the recommendations of state and federal advisors, and made chicken farming a mass-production business.

Now what does all this add up to in terms of a more comprehensive image of the American Jew? What is it here that sets the Jew off in contrast to his gentile neighbor? Is it not that he represents in that New Jersey community—as he is coming, along with his goyim cultural fellows, to represent in many other American communities—the image not of the Jew or Jewishness as such, but the *emerging new image of humanity?*

Who do men say that I am? How much more inspiring, how much more compelling, yes, and how much more complimentary the answer when, with reference to one of Jewish or of any other background, it comes back, not with the protestation that here is a super- or an "alrightnik," but rather: "You, why you put me in mind of nothing less than the new image of humanity!"

The Meaning of Tolerance

WILLIAM P. JENKINS

I should like to consider the central problem of tolerance. First of all to consider what we mean by tolerance, and what we should mean by it, what are the limitations of tolerance, and how we can act in a really tolerant way, still holding fast to our convictions. I think the problem arises really because we are living in a revolutionary age, and tolerance is one of the first casualties of such an era. If we go back and look at the period of the reformation, which was a previous revolutionary age, we see that tolerance was virtually eradicated at that time. A very tolerant spirit had grown up in western Europe in the period that we call the Renaissance and the Pope himself could tolerate a man like Erasmus who was extremely critical of the Roman Catholic Church. He not only could tolerate him, but he is supposed even to have offered him a cardinal's hat. Then within a generation all of that tolerant atmosphere was destroyed because of the Protestant revolt.

We live in an era of revolt and revolution again; we live at a time when new ideas are contesting with each other and with the old ideas for mastery in the world. And when people hold fast to a new or an old idea, tolerance is likely to be destroyed. A great deal of tolerance arises either from a feeling of well-being—when there is no threat from new ideas—or more usually from a feeling of indifference. I would just suggest that the extent of toleration in our community is far more a measure of the religious indifference of our community than it has been a measure of anything positive. You men who belong to luncheon clubs, service clubs, all of which profess toleration, one of the things that is always established in these groups is that there will be no arguing about religion, and that Catholics and in some of the more enlightened clubs even Jews and Unitarians and Anglicans can all mix together and get along wonderfully. But the main reason for that is that none of you pays any attention to what you believe religiously. It is more a matter of indifference than it is a matter of outgoing, kindly understanding spirit—not that it is not there: it is. But much of it is this negative thing. Now in an age when new ideas arise to contest the ground with the old ideas, indifference disappears and we sharpen our convictions and ride forth on our white chargers in defense of our ideals and our ideas. Tolerance is very often the victim of this. Tolerance was the victim of the French Revolution, it was the victim of the Russian Revolution, and it was the victim of the German reaction under Hitler. We cannot expect tolerance to be found among people who think they have all of the truth, and that is one of the dangers that we fear. Yet I am alarmed at the intolerance that exists among many so-called liberal people. Perhaps it exists in part because of a misunderstanding of tolerance itself.

Fred Bratton, a professor at Springfield, Massachusetts, writing in *The Humanist* several years ago, said this:

> Another liberal virtue which came dangerously close to being a vice was the emphasis on tolerance. The respect for persons, so typical of liberalism, and the recognition that each man is as good as the next, degenerated into the flabby idea that everybody is right. This loss of the power of discrimination made for mediocrity and smugness. If everybody was right, there was nothing to fight for. When tolerance for people turned into complacency about convictions, liberalism lost its leadership and handed it over to the forces of authoritarianism.

Now there, I think, we see one of the things that has happened in regard to tolerance: either the liberal has bogged down into the notion that tolerance is complacency and that everybody might be right, and therefore nobody is right, nobody is wrong, and you do not have any convictions; or they have rejected this idea and said, "Well, we have to be intolerant about some things." I think there is much misunderstanding along this line.

Tolerance is not the absence of conviction. Tolerance is not indifference. If tolerance is to have any significance for us (and I think we need a real tolerance in this present age) then we must have more positive expression of it. I found such an expression in the writings of Phillips Brooks, an Episcopalian of the nineteenth century. He said:

> Seek with study and with prayer for the most clear and confident convictions, and when you have found them hold them so largely and vitally that they shall be to you not the walls that separate you from your brothers who have other convictions than yours, but the medium through which you enter into understanding of and sympathy with them—as the ocean, which was once the barrier between nations, is now the highway for their never-resting ships, and makes the whole world one. This is true tolerance.

Now he is saying there that tolerance is something that grows out of the way we hold conviction—not the ab-

sence of conviction, not indifference but an actual attempt to forego our own convictions for ourselves and then hold them in such a way that we are not bothered when someone holds a different conviction, but can hold them together, can discuss our convictions with each other as equals.

A. Wakefield Slaton says: "We should reverence the reverence of others, and not what they revere." So if we are to have the conditions of tolerance, we must first have conviction, but then we must hold that conviction in understanding and in an enlightened sort of way. This necessarily brings in a certain percentage of doubt: that is to say, we will never hold our convictions in a large way, as Phillips Brooks would have us hold them, unless we always recognize that these convictions might at some time be open to question. We cannot hold anything as an absolute truth, which can never be contradicted and be very tolerant about it. I think this perhaps establishes the framework of tolerance. The framework of tolerance is the framework which recognizes a fluid society, a society in process of growth and change and development. A static society will not have the framework for tolerance. Only a society which recognizes, or in which the members recognize that they can be wrong—that someday they may be wrong—only such a society can maintain an attitude and an atmosphere of tolerance.

The question, I think, arises for us because our ideas have become activated in this present age. We have ideologies, we have beliefs, that are held strongly, convictions that are held as absolutes, that are warring with each other for control in the world today, so that we have to ask ourselves these questions about tolerance in this kind of a world context. We say that we will "reverence the reverence of others, not what they revere." And if we accept that, we are still left in a condition of perplexity because we are compelled to ask, "Can we reverence the reverences of an authoritarian or a totalitarian?" Can we, in other words, respect and allow to exist side by side with our own conviction, the convictions of those people who believe that we ought to have a totalitarian state? That question has posed the greatest threat to tolerance and the greatest threat to freedom in our time.

It is all well and good to say we can tolerate the person of Jewish beliefs or one who believes like a Unitarian, or a person who believes in the Anglican way, because we are not so fussy about those beliefs and we have found at least that they can exist together without threatening our general way of life. But these other things we see to be a threat to our way of life, and so we say, "How much can we tolerate these things?" It is a question that is raised again when we are face to face with the efforts of the Roman Catholic Church to establish not only itself and its principles but to establish a greater measure of control over the education of the young. We ask ourselves, "How much can we tolerate in this direction?" Too often when we think about the word *tolerance* we think about it in that old way which accepts and almost condones what the other person believes.

Tolerance sometimes with us is a fear to express opposition, and there is a great deal of that kind of tolerance existing today. A great many people are afraid to express different ideas, afraid to express opposition to the loyalty hysteria that has been adduced and developed in our times, not because they are really tolerant but because they are afraid. Many people have been tolerant toward the Roman Catholics, toward Fascists, towards Communists, toward any variety of groups and people that have made themselves heard loudly in our present time, not because of any nobility of motive, but because they are afraid to be different or because they are afraid to speak out. That again is not tolerance, that is fear and it will not lead to a happy situation in our community.

I should like to go back to an old and early Unitarian experience on this question of tolerance which may place the thing in a little different light. Sometimes when we look at an historical event we are far enough away from it that we can be a little more objective about it. I have always been disturbed about the experience of the Unitarians in Poland. In the sixteenth century a group of men went into Poland and organized a church which came to be known as the Socinian Church because the leader was Faustus Socinus. Our Unitarian historians tell us, on the basis of all the facts that they have been able to dig out, that at one time nearly one-third of the population of Poland was at least nominally Unitarian. But the Unitarians were tolerant, and they existed amongst a group of other religious people, part of whom were Calvinists—Protestant Calvinists—and part of whom were Roman Catholics. Then the Jesuits moved into the country and by various means began to cut into the power and numbers of the Unitarians. They did it by what we today would call "subversive" methods. But the Unitarians did not rise up in strong opposition, they did not rise up and throw the Jesuits out of the country because they were tolerant. They did go to the Protestants and ask for cooperation; they said, "Now here, if we can get together to defend ourselves we can meet and face this threat." But the Protestants were intolerant and said, "We would rather be dead than to be allied with representatives of the devil, like you." And so it was not long until they were dead! Here is an example on the one hand of tolerance—and I should tell the end of this story, that within a century Socinianism, Unitarianism, was wiped off the face of Poland, and Protestantism was almost entirely driven out. Here is a case where the Unitarian group was tolerant in the way that they understood tolerance. Here also was the case where another group was intolerant against what they considered threats from both sides, and were the victims of their intolerance. I think there are many lessons to be learned from that. I think it raises the question as to whether we can have tolerance unless it exists within the framework which I mentioned at the very outset.

I do not believe that tolerance is possible outside the framework that says, and insists and establishes for all people within a given society, that freedom must be maintained. Therefore I question the possibility of being tolerant toward groups or movements whose purpose is to destroy that framework. And so if we know that a religious or a political group is setting out with at least a long range point of view of destroying the framework of tolerance, then it is not possible for us to act in the same way toward those groups as we would toward other groups that respect the framework of tolerance. When the Roman Catholic Church says that it should have the sole right to educate the young, and says that there is no truth other than its truth, when it says at many points that if it were a majority in any community it would eliminate the source of error (we are one of the sources of error) then we can recognize that this group does not respect the limitations, the

framework of tolerance. And so if any of my friends say to me, "You are intolerant of the Roman Catholic Church," I can only answer this: that I try to be tolerant toward the Roman Catholic as an individual, and I think with some measure of success; that I try to be tolerant of the Roman Catholic Church as a religious solution for the people who adhere to the Roman Catholic Church, and I think I achieve that with some measure of success. But as to being tolerant of the ideas which would destroy the very things that I stand for—no, I cannot be tolerant in that sense. Nor do I believe that any of the rest of us can be tolerant in that sense of the word. Here, I think, is where we have failed so often as liberals. We have confused the tolerance toward the person, and the tolerance toward the ideas.

I would be tolerant toward the idea in this respect—and I think that here again is a matter of a rather fine distinction—we must tolerate the expression of the idea in order that our society might consider the idea for whatever it is worth. But we must never let the advocates of the idea achieve so much power that they destroy the very framework in which we consider the ideas, that they destroy the very framework of tolerance itself. That would be my answer to the Communist as well as to the Roman Catholic. I think we have to distinguish between being tolerant to the individual who is a Communist; I think we have to distinguish also between being tolerant to the idea that is being expressed by the Communist and insisting that we consider the idea. But we cannot be tolerant to that part of Communism which would make a totalitarian state wherein contrary views could never be expressed. Tolerance cannot condone the threatening ideas of other ideologies. Tolerance cannot permit us to hide from the threat that might be embodied in opposite points of view because tolerance can only exist in that framework which maintains freedom. But within that there is a great deal of room. Here is the point where we need to be more tolerant than we have been, where our society needs to be more tolerant. We have always given lip service to this idea that we let ideas compete with each other in the free and open marketplace, believing with Milton that so long as truth be in the field, truth cannot be defeated. But very seldom have we actually lived up to this.

In the religious wars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries we demonstrated an intolerance on all sides for views of different kinds, and while that fell away partly because of indifference, it has never completely fallen away, and anyone who reads the rise and fall of the peaks of tolerance on this continent will see that we have never at any moment been really tolerant of ideas, that we have always been suspicious. You can point in any generation in the last 150 years to examples of men who have been dismissed from University posts, or of ministers who have been driven out of their pulpits, or of other men and women who have been persecuted in a variety of ways because they promoted and held an idea different from that of their fellows. We have not been tolerant of the other ideas. We have not been willing always to consider the other ideas in a free and open atmosphere. We have been far too much the victims of our own prejudices and our own beliefs. In times such as this, the peaks of tolerance fall away and we find ourselves confronted with an anti-tolerant hysteria. This again we must avoid. We must remember that an individual has a right to life in our society, he has a right to think as he will in our society, even though he thinks and lives differently from ourselves. The only limitation that we can put on that right is that we cannot allow him to destroy the framework in which tolerance can exist. Short of that we must allow him to have his life; we must allow him not only to have his thoughts but to express his thoughts.

This, then, is tolerance; to find and hold convictions of our own in such a way that we recognize the rights of others to seek, to hold, and to express convictions different from our own; to give free play to the competition of ideas, restricting only the action that would destroy the very framework of tolerance.

The Liberal Way for Today

JOHN H. HERSHEY

The liberal way means freedom, on the one hand, from dogmatic church creeds and, on the other hand, from total rule doctrines of Fascism and Communism.

It means being free to seek the truth by experience, inquiry, science, and reason. Thus it does not mean believing anything we please.

It means emphasizing the Golden Rule taught by Confucius, Gautama, Hillel, Jesus, and others.

The following outline is a liberal way of thinking about God and man that aims at being consistent with present-day knowledge.

The Cosmos (Nature, Universe) is the highest unity that we know. Many and varied are the things and beings of the world; yet all are parts of one vast and enduring Whole or Cosmos. The soil of earth, the brain of man, the stars of heaven are all related to one another. The same chemical elements make up our globe and the distant stars. Gravitation rules both falling stones and moving planets. These and many other facts show that the Cosmos is a unity.

The Cosmos, in the second place, is creative. This does not mean making something from nothing, but rather making the new out of the old. Atoms, plants, animals, and man are all produced by the creative power of the Cosmos itself. Daily the seemingly inexhaustible Cosmos brings about new things and beings, none of which are exactly alike. From non-living matter probably arose the simplest form of life; from the latter, plants and animals; from animals, the human brain; from it, man's capacity to love the true, the good, and the beautiful, which is his spiritual nature. Thus the Cosmos is creative.

Since the Cosmos is the highest known unity and is creative, we call it God. God and the Cosmos are one.

We are, as noted above, creatures of the Cosmos (God). Our whole being—body and mind—is a product of cosmic processes. We have been millions of years in the making. We are not like sticks stuck into the earth from the outside, but are like trees growing out of the earth, coming to fruit in our spiritual nature.

But we are more than creatures. We are or can be

creators. Man's creative power has developed civilization. Language, machines, science, art, philosophy, religion are all products of human beings. We, being creators, share in the productive energy of the Cosmos (God).

What, then, can we today create?

We can create a far better world on earth for men, women, and children. Such is the glorious goal!

It means, among other things, bringing about a higher standard of living, wholesome homes, beautiful cities, more education, civil liberties, separation of church and state, political democracy, racial equality, a peaceable and cooperative world, and the growth of happy and responsible human beings.

The method of achieving such a goal is not by violence or dictatorship, but by intelligence, good-will, and coöperation.

Thus we are creative persons capable of advancing the evolutionary process of the Cosmos (God) toward higher ends by building a much better civilization!

The liberal way is the better way for today!

Now Is the Hour

J. RAY SHUTE

Since becoming president of the Laymen's League, in May, 1953, I have had the opportunity of attending many conferences, visiting 125 Unitarian societies throughout the continent and speaking to these liberals in forty-five states, two Canadian provinces, and Mexico. I have learned a lot. For one thing, I have discovered that we Unitarians are a great "bunch of folks"; we are unique in many ways. Perhaps our greatest strength lies in our weakness; our greatest unity in our diversity. While we have no corner on diversity and certainly no authority unique in granting to our members a right they already possessed—namely, the right to differ, at the same time we are, perhaps, to be congratulated on our insistence that our membership dedicate itself to variety. In itself, this is unique. We have learned what a virtue smallness can be and some of the values which attach to the little groups. We have many serious problems, but bigness is not one of them.

As much as we are dominated by our clergy, we have both the right and the duty to run our own affairs as we deem best. We are not victims of clericalism and we owe no debt to conformity. As a body, we are as free as we wish to be—the choice is with us. In matters of belief we are free to pursue our individual course, unfettered by dogma, creed, articles of faith, or edicts and pronouncements. However, we are bound by reason, faith and tradition to accept truth as it is discovered by our best methods of pursuing and evaluating the secrets of our universe and ourselves. Since truth is not revealed but discovered through methods we have developed, we stand in humility before knowledge.

I have found that there is no Unitarian position on any one thing. We are as divided in our opinions on politics, economics, and religion as any group on the face of the earth. Our sole agreement seems to be our right to disagree. We have every known shade of opinion conceivable in our body. This must be a source of confusion to many guest speakers and visitors of our societies. One never knows just what to expect next of us liberals—as a fact, we do not know either. Our opinions are so nebulous and tentative that ofttimes they practically disappear as values and exist only as vapors. We fail to agree on the nature of man, of the universe, and whether or not there is God, irrespective of Mary's role in the matter. Yes, we are a refreshingly unique "bunch of folks."

Within the past decade there has developed a program for isolated liberals which is well-calculated to change the very nature of our movement if it continues to expand: the Church of the Larger Fellowship and the Fellowship movement—really one program. This plan of the small group as an entity, lay-led, harks back to the original idea of the Society of Friends and has relevancy far more significant than many of us seemingly realize. It has changed the course of Unitarianism and is developing a new type of liberal, who is independent, self-reliant, resourceful, courageous and, yes, cunning to an extent that we had not previously seen. As these fellowships grow and many of them eventuate into churches, these churches are quite different from those organized professionally and in a short period of time and dependent from the start—to a large degree—upon the ministers. One notices a marked difference between the church which grew from a fellowship and the one gathered in one fast campaign of organization. And this is an interesting comparison also by virtue of the fact that the one man who is chiefly responsible for the idea of fellowships was also our primary church organizer for a decade—Lon Call. Yet, we can, I repeat, note a tremendous difference in the two types of churches. There is quite a difference in the attitude and status of the membership. But this needs no elaboration here. The point at issue is that the lay-led society develops along somewhat different lines from the minister-led society.

The relationship of the fellowship to the community in which it is located is somewhat different from that of the church. Having no vested interest in fellowships leads to possibilities for public relations along novel lines and within lay concepts of what a religious society should be and how it should relate itself to the community in which it functions. We might well feel more and more the impact of this type of operation. It will influence our thinking more and more as experience is gained in the field from coast to coast. We have not heard the last on this fascinating innovation. Much more is yet to be reported.

Chapters of the Laymen's League are just awakening to the fact that fellowships, too, are lay groups and are pointing the way for many worthwhile programs and activities for our chapters. The relationship between these groups will grow stronger as chapters discover that fellowships are no longer novelties that we try to dramatize for their entertainment value at May Meetings. These are really Unitarian societies, which represent our way of life in many communities where, otherwise, liberalism would be unknown. Professional people seem to be more active in fellowships than in churches, and therefore, leadership in these groups is usually very competent. In fellowships it is understood that every member must function or the little group cannot survive; consequently, the quality of operation is usually unique. Unless this were true,

our groups could not function as successfully as they do.

Another thing observed in the field has been the importance of the observation, practice, and dissemination of the democratic process. Democracy and liberalism are twin lamps lighting man's pathway. Unless Unitarians constantly fight for the preservation of democracy, they deny their birthright and risk their very lives. Most of our people seem to realize this. Some few, however, have this to learn. Again, the fellowships consider this elementary and are actually fierce in their insistence on the application of the principle in every situation that arises. This is not to say that the same spirit does not animate every church I have visited, but in fellowships this is the first thing a visitor notices. Out in the field, especially in the small group, this is basic to existence.

Another observation, gathered largely from fellowships, is the trend toward a more secular religious point of view. Since most of the speakers appearing before fellowships are laymen—teachers, scientists, lawyers, and businessmen—less and less stress is placed upon religious liturgy, form and ceremony—as well as sermons and the worship motif—and more and more upon content and discussion of lectures. Fellowships apparently do not consider it necessary when one prays to shout aloud, as do the Pharisees, but prefer never to shout at all and, indeed, seldom to pray! It is this spirit that most generally prevails. It is a new trend in religious experience, and many of the newly "converted" Unitarians have a greatly differing view of the role and function of a religious society from their counterparts in the parish church. Novelty and variety are valued elements in the fellowships. Rigidity and routine are generally frowned upon. So accustomed have fellowships become to having fresh points of view presented and discussed that many would be somewhat unhappy if they had to settle down for long periods of time with one leader, representing one basic philosophy of life and one point of view. This might also lead to the development of a different type of church in the future. Who can tell at this stage of the game? One thing for sure: the idea of worship is on the way out. Too many liberals are unwilling to continue this outmoded form of religious liturgy which is essentially in contradiction to the basic assumptions of liberals, both Humanists and Theists. Liberals feel, generally, that the relationship between man and his greatest ideal does not involve worship, ritual, petition, or the techniques usually associated with more primitive religious institutions of a supernatural and authoritarian nature. These liberals—of the fellowships in particular—feel that we should develop more fully the skills and abilities of our members, plus the best we can utilize of all creative and expressive arts: music, art, literature, the dance, drama, and research into newer fields of individual and group expression. They feel that we are too much wedded to the past in respect to our procedures. Therefore, we find in our fellowships a freshness and vigor that is at once challenging and meaningful. They are experimenting far more than our churches—through both desire as well as expediency—in this matter of programming and presenting liberal religion. And let me be perfectly honest: there arises — again and again — controversy in these little groups as to the best and most meaningful types of programs. There are traditionalists—even in the fellowships! Even so, the experimentation continues and some of the most delightful experiences I have ever had have been in these fellowship meetings.

They are alive and contemporary.

If liberalism is a way of life involving experiment and evolution, then we dare not become so rooted in our individual and parochial habit patterns that we resist change because it upsets the status quo. This would appear to be illiberal. We do not discard values because of their antiquity, nor should we retain them for the same reason. Ours should be the evolution of experiment as a religious method. This would appear to be a valid definition of our position. We need also to desist from placing undue value or importance upon words. We should never fear epithets, nor value compliments too highly. Ours is the role of function: we become in fact that as which we function. Hence, we are liberal only when we so function.

I am convinced, as a result of driving by car a distance equal to two trips around the earth, that our future is in every way bright. I have not visited all of our parishes, naturally, but I have covered a lot of territory and I have talked with thousands of Unitarians. I like the way most of our people are thinking, talking, and living. They furnish the stuff out of which great movements are created. Now is the hour; our greatest opportunity is at hand. If we but have courage, imagination and zeal, we can extend our concept of religion into every corner of the continent. Times are propitious for our message. We must find means and methods for the acceleration of our extension opportunities. Ours is a dynamic and living faith. We must keep evolving and expanding—it is our very life.

THE FIELD

(*Continued from page* 22)

Order to teach while wearing religious garb would require extension of like permission to members of other religions. Eventually the public schools would become a competitive forum among the various religions. This clearly is forbidden by the First Amendment."

However, ACLU disagreed with the minister-plaintiff's recommendation that public monies be denied the public schools employing the Catholic sisters.

"Whether or not a person should be permitted to teach does not depend upon his creed, religion, ideologies, or associations," the brief asserted. "It depends upon the integrity of his work with his students. . . . Removal of a teacher because of membership in a particular religious order would involve a continuous succession of invasions of fundamental personal rights and freedoms. Such discrimination would curtail the teacher's precious freedom of conscience and association."

—*ACLU Bulletin.*

The Impudence of the Mystics

GEORGE LAWRENCE PARKER

The mystical religious poets, both ancient and modern, use impudence as their tool and instrument for finding and expressing the value of God to man and the equal value of man to God.

They do not argue about truth but dart in and seize it to satisfy their, and all men's, insatiable appetite. Like the humming-bird, they catch the fragrance of God in all the festoons of truth which like honeysuckle vines hang down from the trellises of nature and from every window of man's spirit. That fragrance the mystic religious poets are determined to capture and to spread through an unsavory world. It is not theirs to reason why, for they know that there is a reason beyond reason which irresistibly urges them on. The master-key was given to them by the Master Mystic of all time or by someone who, knowingly or unknowingly, was seeking the same fragrance. "Blessed are they who hunger and thirst after righteousness for they shall be filled." That is the logic behind the universe, and the mystical poet makes no apology for appropriating that logic by direct attack. His faith justifies his over-boldness and his impudence.

Many a page of the Old Testament is literally packed with the impudence of humans toward the Divine Spirit. That is why children love and understand the Old Testament better than older people understand it, for children are impudent and sincere, as older people are not. It is fair to say that all children are mystics, and that is, in part at least, why the Master Mystic said, "Except ye become as little children ye cannot enter the Kingdom of God."

Such impudence is found in Abraham's argument with God about the proposed destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. Abraham actually forced a bargain price upon Jehovah, from a hundred righteous souls to ten righteous souls, and Sodom would be saved. The same sort of impudence was used by Jonah in saving Nineveh, although in the end Jonah suffered personal defeat. But Nineveh was saved and, in a degree, the Gospel of Forgiveness preceded the New Testament Gospel. Without the element of over-boldness, many of The Psalms could never have been written.

Nor could St. Augustine ever have said, "Trust God and do as you please," thus relieving us of the heart-breaking burden of fear and worry of constantly offending God. The mystics after all may prove our rescuers from the necessity of always apologizing for being really religious. Apologetics for faith has too long been our curse. It was Emily Dickinson, the little "New England Humming-Bird" who wrote:

> I never saw a moor and I never saw the sea,
> But I know what heather smells like
> And what a wave must be.
> I never called on God nor visited in Heaven
> But I'm as certain of the place
> As if a chart were given.

Emily was raising impudence to the nth degree and she was justified. She put the soul's instinct far above all creeds or dogmas.

Emerson had a boldness that was clad with dignity and grandeur but which nevertheless helped New England to see that God is a "Great Companion" (see Robert Leaven's two books, *The Great Companions*). Among modern mystical religious poets we get a wholesale view of this Impudence. At first we may shudder, then we kneel to praise and to pray. Take Rainer Maria Rilke's:

> What will you do, God, when I die?
> When I, your pitcher, broken, lie?
> When I, your drink, go stale or dry?
> I am your garb, the trade you ply,
> you lose your meaning, losing me.
>
> Homeless without me, you will be
> robbed of your welcome, warm and sweet.
> I am your sandals: your tired feet
> will wander bare for want of me.
>
> Your mighty cloak will fall away.
> Your glance that on my cheek was laid
> and pillowed warm, will seek, dismayed,
> the comfort that I offered once—
> to lie, as sunset colours fade
> in the cold lap of alien stones.
> What will you do, God? I am afraid.

This verges on impudence but the value of man to God is put beyond any doubt.

Francis Thompson is even more impressive in his boldness:

> O World invisible, we view thee.
> O World intangible, we touch thee,
> O World unknowable, we know thee,
> Inapprehensible, we clutch thee!
>
> Does the fish soar to find the ocean,
> The eagle plunge to find the air—
> That we ask of the stars in motion
> If they have rumour of thee there?
>
> Not where the wheeling systems darken,
> And our benumbed conceiving soars!—
> The drift of pinions, would we hearken,
> Beats at our own clay-shuttered doors.
>
> The angels keep their ancient places;
> Turn but a stone, and start a wing!
> 'Tis ye, 'tis your estranged faces,
> That miss the many-splendoured thing.
>
> But (when so sad thou canst not sadder)
> Cry;—and upon thy so sore loss
> Shall shine the traffic of Jacob's ladder
> Pitched betwixt Heaven and Charing Cross.
>
> Yea, in the night, my Soul, my daughter,
> Cry,—clinging Heaven by the hems;
> And lo, Christ walking on the water,
> Not of Gennesaret, but Thames!

To call the impudence of the mystics a complete or final approach to truth or to God would be foolish and I have intended no such appeal. What I have intended is to say that in the midst of an overpowering materialistic age, when science and mechanics are making impersonal forces that drown us, making robots that talk like humans and humans that talk like robots, we should rescue human personality by the bold direct approach to truth, by the hunger of the soul, and the universal desire for truth and God that resides in every heart. For as Santayana, a true mystic, said:

> It is not wisdom to be only wise
> And on the inward vision close the eyes,
> But it is wisdom to believe the heart.
> Columbus found the world and had no chart
>
> Save that which faith deciphered in the skies.
> To trust the invincible surmise.
> His only science and his only art.

It appears, as Santayana suggests, that the liberal expression of religion carries in its quiver one arrow that has been too little recognized and far too little popularized. It is the impudence of the mystical religious poets that gives us the clue, which is that the freedom of science, art, thought, and life make up one basic unity. For this unbroken oneness, the heart of all humanity is aching.

Western Unitarian Conference

700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois
RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary

ANNUAL MEETINGS SUMMARIZED

The 103rd Annual Meetings of the Western Unitarian Conference were held in Des Moines, Iowa, April 22, 23, and 24, 1955. The following is a summary of the actions and events which took place:

1. The minutes of the previous Annual Meeting were approved as recorded and ordered filed in the archives of the Conference.

2. The Treasurer, Curtis W. Reese, distributed copies of the balance sheet for the first eleven months of the fiscal year. He reported that estimates of income and expenses for April indicated that expenditures would be within the budget and that there would be a small cash operating balance. Increases in the capital funds were in excess of $66,000.00. The report was accepted with thanks and referred to Arthur Young & Company for audit.

3. The Chairman of the Religious Education Committee, Mrs. G. Richard Kuch, was not able to be present. The secretary read her report. The committee had concerned itself with the plans for the religious education program at the Geneva Conference in June, the field trip of Miss Frances Wood through the Conference in February, and in publishing a news letter. At the conclusion of her report Mrs. Kuch recommended that the Conference employ a field worker in Religious Education.

After discussion of this recommendation and the need for additional personnel in other areas of specialized service, it was voted to refer the recommendation with approval to the Program-Planning Committee.

4. The Program-Planning Committee, John W. Brigham, Chairman, reported that during the year it had given serious consideration to the problems of inter-church communication, college center churches and student work, and to the coordinating of the fall programs of the sub-regional areas. "The Effective Liberal Organization" is the recommended theme for the fall conferences.

5. The Nominating Committee, Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., Chairman, reported on the methods used and the action of the Committee in presenting the following names for membership on the Board of the Conference for terms of four years:

Mr. Clifford W. Mills, Denver, Colorado.
Mrs. Robert Risk, Indianapolis, Indiana.
Mr. Charles VanDine, Dayton, Ohio.

It was voted to accept the report and instruct the Secretary to cast a unanimous ballot for the election of the slate as presented.

6. The Secretary, Randall Hilton, reported on the growing activities in the Conference, the general excellent state of health of the churches and fellowships, which numbered 57 churches and 40 fellowships, including two new churches and seven new fellowships.

7. The Committee on Resolutions, Edward Redman, Chairman, presented the following resolutions:

(a) Resolution on the Hospitality of the Des Moines Church:

"WHEREAS the minister, Charles W. Phillips, and the congregation of the Unitarian Church of Des Moines, Iowa, have been wonderfully involved in the pains and joys of a campaign of fund raising for a new church building; and

"WHEREAS, in spite of such involvement and preoccupation, the minister and congregation have shown themselves gracious and conscientious hosts; and

"WHEREAS expansiveness of hospitality with its consequence of expanding needs is becoming the sign and symbol of our movement in the Western Conference area: Therefore be it

"RESOLVED, That this 103rd Annual Meeting of the Western Unitarian Conference hereby express with a standing vote of thanks its appreciation to the congregation of the Unitarian church of Des Moines, and to Charles W. Phillips, its minister, for all things done to assure the comfort of the Conference delegates, for the hospitality extended, and program offered, but most of all for being a growing church vigorously led, an example of minister and people working together toward exciting and durable ends." (PASSED.)

(b) Resolution on the *Des Moines Register:*

"WHEREAS the *Des Moines Register*, on February 10, 1955, gave editorial invitation to the Soviet Union to send a delegation of agriculturists to Iowa to learn how corn and hogs ought to be raised; and

"WHEREAS this invitation was accepted by the Soviet Union in an announcement issued on March 1, 1955; and

"WHEREAS the United States Department of State has given its approval, subject to the usual rules and regulations; and

"WHEREAS Unitarians, generally, have been concerned about the cause of peace, the means of increasing international and intercultural understanding, and the improvement of living standards in all parts of the world: Therefore be it

"RESOLVED, That the delegates to this 103rd Annual Meeting of the Western Unitarian Conference express to the *Des Moines Register* their appreciation for this outstanding example it has in this instance set, and in many others also, for creative journalism; and be it

"RESOLVED further, That concern be expressed to all suitable agencies that the progress of this project, and others like it, be assisted and expedited in all feasible ways toward the goals of increasing the number of opportunities for the exchange of ideas and techniques in fields of endeavor where security is not a consideration, promoting growth of mutuality, respect, and understanding between peoples, relaxing the tension between rival nations, and by these means strengthening the possibility of co-existence in peace." (PASSED.)

(c) Resolution on Joseph Cady Allen:

"WHEREAS Joseph Cady Allen, formerly minister in Bernardston, Massachusetts, and Geneseo, Illinois, passed away in Rock Island, Illinois on April 22, 1955, at the age of eighty-six: Therefore be it

"RESOLVED, That the Western Unitarian Conference, assembled in its 103rd Annual Session, record its sense of loss and its deep appreciation of his long, faithful and devoted service in the Unitarian Ministry, and especially of his dignity, integrity and interest in the arts, and be it

"RESOLVED further, That a copy of this resolution be spread on the records of this Conference and

a copy sent to the surviving members of his family." (PASSED.)

(d) Resolution on name of Council of Liberal Churches. The Davenport Church presented a resolution in support of a communication from the All Souls Unitarian Church of New York, urging the renaming of the "Council of Liberal Churches" to the "Council of Unitarian and Universalist Churches". After discussion the resolution was defeated.

(e) Resolution on Walter H. McPherson:

"WHEREAS Walter Henry McPherson, for forty years minister of the Joliet Universalist Church, passed away on Tuesday, April 12, 1955; and

"WHEREAS he was beloved in his own church and community, noted for the strength of his mind and the clarity and force of his thought, and likewise for his zeal for the social gospel; and

"WHEREAS his influence extended far beyond the confines of his own church and community throughout the entire Middle West: Therefore be it

"RESOLVED by the Western Unitarian Conference, in its 103rd Annual Meeting, that his passing be noted with profoundest regret and with an expression of highest appreciation for his service in the cause of Liberal Religion and Human Welfare." (PASSED.)

8. New Business:

(a) Biennial Conference in Detroit, August 24-29, 1955. Mrs. Edgar Braun, a delegate from Detroit and a member of the Board of the Western Unitarian Conference urged the delegates to this Conference to attend the General Conference of the American Unitarian Association in Detroit. She announced that a warm welcome awaits everyone who attends the Detroit meetings which will be held in conjunction with those of the Universalist Church of America. Mr. Norman Cousins is scheduled for the main address.

(b) Rev. Donald Thompson raised the question as to whether ministers serving Unitarian Fellowships should not have a vote the same as ministers of churches at the meetings of the Conference. It was voted that the Board of the Conference should study the possibility of amending the By-Laws so that ministers of Fellowships could have a vote.

(c) A suggestion was made that the Midwest Universalist Conference should be asked to meet at the same time and place as the next meeting of the Western Unitarian Conference. No action was taken.

(d) Mrs. Charles Boynton of Elkhart, Indiana, a delegate from the South Bend church told of a project of her family to establish a community for retired persons near St. Petersburg, Florida. Persons interested should contact Mrs. Boynton at 1923 Greenleaf Blvd., Elkhart, Indiana.

(e) Place of the next Annual Meeting. Invitations were received to hold the 1956 Annual Meetings of the Conference in Ann Arbor, Michigan, and Madison, Wisconsin. (Madison, Wisconsin, has been chosen by the Executive Committee of the Conference as the site of the next Annual Meeting.)

9. Highlights of the Conference Program:

(a) Alliance program and tea at the Des Moines Art Center.

(b) Lecture on "Whither Are We Bound?—A Scientific View," by Professor Alfred E. Emerson, of the University of Chicago.

(c) Talk on "What Unites Us," by William Roger Greeley, Moderator of the American Unitarian Association.

(d) "Making Use of Your Local Church History," an illustrated program by Rev. Charles W. Phillips, Des Moines.

(e) A Theatre-in-the-Round presentation by the Des Moines' Drama Workshop.

(f) "Putting You in Unitarianism," an address by C. David Connolly, Rockford, Illinois, President of the United Unitarian Appeal.

(g) "Making the World Safe for Intelligence," the Conference Sermon by Arthur W. Olsen, Toledo.

MINISTERS' INSTITUTE

The Western Conference Branch of the Unitarian Ministers' Association held an institute prior to the meetings of the Conference. Papers were heard, prepared by Rev. Arthur Foote, St. Paul, Minnesota; Rev. Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., Indianapolis, Indiana; Rev. Raymond B. Johnson, Boston, Massachusetts; Rev. Waitstill Sharp, Davenport, Iowa; and Mr. Frank Schramm, Burlington, Iowa. The commentators on the first two papers were Rev. L. Wendell Hughes, Dayton, Ohio; Rev. John W. Cyrus, Omaha, Nebraska; Rev. Max D. Gaebler, Madison, Wisconsin; and Rev. Vincent Silliman, Chicago.

UNITED UNITARIAN APPEAL

The Western Unitarian Conference broke through its restrained giving patterns and set a new record in cash contributions to the United Unitarian Appeal in the 1954-55 campaign. Last year the Conference gave a total of $39,239.00. This year it gave $51,027.00—a 30% increase. This is the largest percentage cash increase of any regional area. However, it represents only 68% of the assigned quota. The percentage of cash increases by sub-regional areas is as follows:

Wisconsin-Northern Illinois	62%
Chicago Area	54%
Minnesota Area	50%
Ohio Valley	29%
Michigan Area	27%
Iowa-Nebraska Area	24%
Abraham Lincoln Area	11%
Rocky Mountain Area	5%

Bravo for—	*% of Goal*
Birmingham, Michigan	155%
Shelbyville, Illinois	113%
South Bend, Indiana	113%
Rockford, Illinois	105%
St. Paul, Minnesota	101%
Angora, Minnesota	100%
Chicago - Beverly	100%
Chicago - Third	100%
Des Moines, Iowa	100%
Detroit - Central	100%
Urbana, Illinois	100%

Salute to—	*% of Cash Increase*
All Souls, Chicago	166%
Madison, Wisconsin	133%
Detroit - Northwest	112%
First Church - Chicago	98%
Minneapolis, Minnesota	91%
Flint, Michigan	53%
Ann Arbor, Michigan	52%
Hobart, Indiana	50%

THANKS go to the twenty-four other churches that gave cash increases, but less than 50% more. The line was drawn at the 50% cash increase, since to make the total appeal goal that was the amount of cash increase needed. Ten churches gave less than last year, and four the same amount. Why? Do you know what your church gave?

The FELLOWSHIPS increased their contributions by $584.00. St. Paul led the churches in giving with $4,211.00 and Burlington led the Fellowships with $384.00.